

**REMARKS**

In the present Amendment, the specification has been amended to correct a clerical error. Claims 1-7 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 13, 16 and 19 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of previous claim 1. No new matter has been added, and entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 8-19 will be pending.

**Response to 35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection**

In paragraph No. 3 of the Action, claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite, because it depends upon two different claims 1 and 10.

As noted, claim 19 has been amended to address the Examiner's concern. Withdrawal of the §112 rejection of claim 19 is respectfully requested.

**Response to Obviousness Type Double Patenting Rejections**

In paragraph No. 5 of the Action, claims 1 and 3-7 are *provisionally* rejected for obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8 and 11-15 of co-pending application No. 10/511,318 (US 2005/0243151).

In paragraph No. 6 of the Action, claims 1-7 are rejected for obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-3, 6, 8-10 and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 7,303,272.

In paragraph No. 7 of the Action, claims 1-7 are rejected for obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 12 and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 7,048,790.

In paragraph No. 8 of the Action, claims 1-7 are rejected for obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1, 4-8 and 12 of U.S. Patent No. 7,211,133.

In paragraph No. 9 of the Action, claims 1 and 3-7 are rejected for obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 6 and 9 of U.S. Patent No. 7,273,519.

In paragraph No. 10 of the Action, claims 1-7 are rejected for obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent No. 7,267,715.

In paragraph No. 11 of the Action, claims 1 and 3-7 are rejected for obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7,220,302.

As noted, claims 1-7 have been cancelled, rendering the above seven double patenting rejections moot.

In paragraph No. 12 of the Action, claims 1-19 are rejected for obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-4, 8 and 9 of U.S. Patent No. 7,208,035.

Without admitting that this double patenting rejection is proper, Applicants submit herewith a Terminal Disclaimer to obviate the rejection.

**Response to 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections**

In paragraph No. 14 of the Action, claims 1 and 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by JP 2003/306623 (English equivalent is US 2005/0243151, “JP ‘623”)

In paragraph No. 15 of the Action, claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102“(e)” as allegedly being anticipated by WO 2004/029166 (English equivalent is 7,303,272, “WO ‘166”)

In paragraph No. 17 of the Action, claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Taguchi *et al* (US 7,048,790, “Taguchi ‘790”).

In paragraph No. 18 of the Action, claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Taguchi (US 7,211,133, “Taguchi ‘133”).

In paragraph No. 20 of the Action, claims 1 and 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Taguchi *et al* (US 7,273,519, “Taguchi ‘519”).

In paragraph No. 22 of the Action, claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Taguchi *et al* (US 7,267,715, “Taguchi ‘715”).

In paragraph No. 24 of the Action, claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Taguchi (US 7,220,302, “Taguchi ‘302”).

As noted, claims 1-7 have been cancelled, rendering the above seven section 102 rejections moot.

In paragraph No. 27 of the Action, claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ogawa *et al* (US 7,208,035, “Ogawa”).

Applicants submit that this rejection should be withdrawn because Ogawa is not prior art with respect to the present claims.

Ogawa was filed on March 26, 2004. This date is later in time than Applicants’ priority dates of November 4, 2003 (JP 2003-374328) and January 9, 2004 (JP 2004-003813).

To remove Ogawa as a reference under § 102(e) and to perfect their claim to priority, Applicants submit herewith a verified English translation of their priority document, JP 2003-374328. Section 112 support for the present claims in the priority document is as shown in the following chart:

Present Claim	Support in Priority Document
8	Claim 1
9	Claim 2
10	Claim 3
11	Claim 4
12	Claim 5
13	Claim 1 and abstract
14	Claim 4
15	Claim 5
16	Claim 2 and abstract
17	Claim 4
18	Claim 5
19	Claim 3 and abstract

In view of the above, Ogawa is not § 102(e) prior art with respect to the present claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 (a) rejection based on Ogawa are respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

Allowance is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sunhee Lee/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

**65565**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

---

Sunhee Lee  
Registration No. 53,892

Date: September 2, 2008